

**REMARKS**

The Examiners' time and cooperation in their interview with Applicant's attorney on April 7, 2009 is, of course, appreciated.

As discussed at the above-mentioned interview, claim 1, the only independent claim in the instant application, has been amended to more clearly define that the transparent planar plate which extends across the direct discharge region as well as the planar scanning plate which extends across and covers the diffuse light discharge region are not only planar, but coplanar with each other. This produces the structure illustrated, for example, in FIGS. 2 and 3 of the patent drawing.

The coplanar transparent plate and scattering plate not only provide an aesthetically pleasing appearance, but also achieve the illumination pattern illustrated, for example, in FIG. 2 of the patent drawing. In particular, the planar reflector 7, also clearly defined in claim 1, allows both direct light reflection through the diffuse scattering plate as illustrated on the right-hand side of the drawing, as well as a more diffuse scattering of the light as illustrated on the left side of FIG. 2. Together, this provides a highly desirable illumination effect from the lamp.

The Patent Examiner, however, has rejected previously submitted claims 1-11 and 14 as unpatentable over Müggenburg when combined with Jongewaard and when further combined with Martin. However, in view of Applicant's amendment to claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that this basis for rejection can no longer stand.

More specifically, the Examiner's primary reference to Müggenburg discloses a lamp having a direct illumination zone covered by a plate 5 as well as reflected light zones covered by diffuse plates 21a and 21b. However, as is clear from FIG. 1 of Müggenburg, the scattering plates 21a and 21b are clearly neither planar and certainly not coplanar with the direct

transparent plate 5. Furthermore, this feature of Applicant's invention is now clearly defined in amended claim 1.

The secondary references to Martin and Jongewaard do not cure this deficiency of Müggenburg. Specifically, the Jongewaard patent merely discloses a ceiling lamp having a direct reflection zone whereas the Martin patent discloses a ceiling lamp having a direct and reflecting zones, which are not coplanar.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, as amended, patentably defines Applicant's invention over the prior art references of record and is, therefore, allowable. Such action is respectfully solicited.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in the fees filed, asserted to be filed or which should have been filed herewith (or with any paper hereafter filed in this application by this firm) to our Deposit Account No. 07-1180.

Dated: April 10, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic Signature: /Douglas W. Sprinkle/  
Douglas W. Sprinkle  
Registration No.: 27,394  
GIFFORD, KRASS, SPRINKLE, ANDERSON  
& CITKOWSKI, P.C.  
2701 Troy Center Drive, Suite 330  
Post Office Box 7021  
Troy, Michigan 48007-7021  
(248) 647-6000  
(248) 647-5210 (Fax)  
Attorney for Applicant